



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,372	12/01/2000	Hans-Rudolf Nageli	ATM-2273	5299

7590 01/09/2003

Virgil H. Marsh
Fisher, Christen & Sabol
Suite 1401
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

TSOY, ELENA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1762

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicant No.	Applicant(s)
	09/726,372	NAGELI ET AL.
	Examiner Elena Tsoy	Art Unit 1762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(e). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-17, 19, 26 and 27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13 and 20-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Response to Amendment

In the Title

A new Title has been entered.

In the Abstract

A new Abstract filed on November 26, 2000 has been entered.

In the Specification

The amendment filed on November 26, 2002 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "The temperature of the aluminum foil, with which the coextruded plastic and adhesion-promotion agent is being combined, is such that the temperature at the surface of the plastic coating and the adhesion-promotion agent lies *below* the crystallite melt point (Tk) of the plastic".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

In the Claims

The Amendment of claims filed on November 26, 2000 has not been entered since it introduces into independent claim 28 a new matter such as the temperature at the surface of the plastic coating and the adhesion-promotion agent lying *below* the crystallite melt point (Tk) of the plastic before heating in an oven. Amended claims 29-54 have not been entered since they depend on claim 28.

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Claims 1-13, 20-25 and election of MAH species in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.
2. Since new claims 28-54 have not been entered for the reasons discussed above, claims 1-13, 20-25 stand objected and rejected for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action mailed on August 20, 2002 (Paper No. 4):

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 4, 12 are objected to because of informalities.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention

Claims 9, 12, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 20, 21, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano et al (US 5,837,360) in view of Williams, Jr. et al (US 4,119,479) and Shaul et al (US 3,925,138).

Claims 7, 10, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano et al (US 5,837,360) in view of Williams, Jr. et al (US 4,119,479) and Shaul et al (US 3,925,138), as applied above, and further in view of Levendusky et al (US 5,919,517).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicants' arguments filed November 26, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicants argue that Takano et al do not teach or suggest heating the formed coextrudate of steel sheet with plastic layers.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Takano et al do teach heating formed coextrudate of a steel sheet with plastic layers by preheating the steel sheet so that the *heating* of the coextrudate is carried out by the pre-heated steel sheet instead of oven.

(B) Applicants argue that combination of Takano et al and Shaul et al is classical hindsight.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the

applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

(C) Applicants argue that Williams, Jr. et al is not a relevant reference to remedy Takano et al since a bonding layer is radiation-curable composition.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Takano et al teach that PP-laminated metal sheet such as steel sheet is well known in the art (See column 1, lines 19-21). Therefore, a method of Takano et al can be used with any other metal sheets. Williams, Jr. et al is cited to show that PP-laminated aluminum sheet is also well known in the art so that a method of Takano et al can be used for making PP-laminated metal sheet depending on intended use of a final product.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1762

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elena Tsoy whose telephone number is (703) 605-1171. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

ET

Elena Tsoy
Examiner
Art Unit 1762

January 6, 2003

Sh. P. Beck
SHRIVE P. BECK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700